

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 **IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
9 **FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**
10

11 CLYDE DAVID CARTER,

12 Plaintiff,

13 v.

14 B. COX,

15 Defendant.
16

No. 2:20-CV-1322-KJM-DMC-P

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

17 Plaintiff, a prisoner proceeding pro se, brings this civil rights action under 42
18 U.S.C. § 1983. On February 21, 2023, mail directed to Plaintiff was returned by the United States
19 Postal Service as undeliverable. Pursuant to Eastern District of California Local Rule 183(b), any
20 party appearing pro se must file and serve a notice of change of address within 63 days of mail
21 being returned. To date, more than 63 days have elapsed since mail was returned and Plaintiff
22 has not notified the Court of a change of address. Defendant's pending motion to dismiss, ECF
23 No. 31, is based on Plaintiff's failure to provide a notice of change of address.

24 The Court must weigh five factors before imposing the harsh sanction of dismissal.
25 See Bautista v. Los Angeles County, 216 F.3d 837, 841 (9th Cir. 2000); Malone v. U.S. Postal
26 Service, 833 F.2d 128, 130 (9th Cir. 1987). Those factors are: (1) the public's interest in
27 expeditious resolution of litigation; (2) the court's need to manage its own docket; (3) the risk of
28 prejudice to opposing parties; (4) the public policy favoring disposition of cases on their merits;

1 and (5) the availability of less drastic sanctions. See id.; see also Ghazali v. Moran, 46 F.3d 52,
2 53 (9th Cir. 1995) (per curiam). A warning that the action may be dismissed as an appropriate
3 sanction is considered a less drastic alternative sufficient to satisfy the last factor. See Malone,
4 833 F.2d at 132-33 & n.1. The sanction of dismissal for lack of prosecution is appropriate where
5 there has been unreasonable delay. See Henderson v. Duncan, 779 F.2d 1421, 1423 (9th Cir.
6 1986). Dismissal has also been held to be an appropriate sanction for failure to inform the district
7 court and parties of a change of address pursuant to local rules. See Carey v. King, 856 F.2d
8 1439, 1440-41 (9th Cir. 1988) (per curiam).

9 Having considered these factors, and in light of Plaintiff's failure to submit a
10 notice of change of address, the Court finds that dismissal of this action is appropriate.

11 Based on the foregoing, the undersigned recommends that this action be dismissed,
12 without prejudice, for lack of prosecution and failure to comply with court rules and orders and
13 that Defendant's motion to dismiss, ECF No. 31, be granted.

14 These findings and recommendations are submitted to the United States District
15 Judge assigned to the case, pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Within 14 days
16 after being served with these findings and recommendations, any party may file written
17 objections with the court. Responses to objections shall be filed within 14 days after service of
18 objections. Failure to file objections within the specified time may waive the right to appeal. See
19 Martinez v. Ylst, 951 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 1991).

20
21 Dated: June 5, 2023



22 DENNIS M. COTA
23 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
24
25
26
27
28